

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 26, 2006. Claims 1-3, 5-23, 25-38, 40-48, 50-54, 57 and 58 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 21, 34, 35 and 45 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-23, 25-38, 40-48, 50-54, 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the “specification does not contain a clear and concise description of the claimed computer-implemented method of validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing the configuration information in a database such that a skilled technician can make and use the invention.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits a declaration under 37 C.F.R. 132, in which a person skilled in the relevant art confirms that the specification does contain a clear and concise description of the claimed computer-implemented method of validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing the configuration information in a database such as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Further, the Examiner asserts that “specification does not contain a clear and concise description of the claimed computer-implemented method of identifying one of a

plurality business sites such that a skilled technician can make and user the invention.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. The above declaration under 37 C.F.R. 132 confirms that the specification does contain a clear and concise description of the claimed computer-implemented method of extracting at least a subset of configuration information from a database based on an extraction parameter identifying one of multiple business sites such as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, with respect to the computer-implemented method of validating configuration information specified by a user, it appears that the Examiner has not appreciated portions of the detailed description section of the present application that discusses a computer-implemented method of validating configuration information specified by a user. For example, according to the present specification, Figure 3 illustrates one embodiment of an alert management system 300 that includes a configuration database 320 and a configuration generator 330 (page 13, para [0066]); Figure 6 illustrates “one embodiment of a configuration generator in the form of digital processing system 600 representing an exemplary workstation, personal computer, server, etc., in which features of the present invention may be implemented” (page 18, para [0082]); Figure 4 illustrates a flow diagram of one embodiment of a method for generating a TelAlert configuration file by the alert management system 300 (pages 13-14, para [0067]). Hence, it is apparent from the above descriptions of Figures 3, 4 and 6 that the method illustrated in Figure 4 is computer-implemented.

Furthermore, the detailed description of Figure 4 specifically states that the method for generating a TelAlert configuration file includes validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing the configuration information in the

database. For example, the detailed description of Figure 4 states the following with respect to one embodiment of the method for generating a TelAlert configuration file:

Storing the configuration information in the manner allows for more administrative control and validation. In one embodiment, database stored procedures ... may be used to provide validation to the insertion ... of new configuration information to the configuration database 320. Therefore, in this way database protocols are used to provide ... value validation checks ... automatically. For example, in this way, a section may be defined to be unique within a table, an administrator may determine which contact methods 540 belong to which contact, or provide a stored procedure that will prevent a contact method from existing without first creating a contact, among other examples. Neither configuration method as described in the prior art allows for such administrative, access and validation control.

(Specification, page 15, para [0073])

Thus, the specification contains a clear and concise description of the claimed computer-implemented method of validating configuration information specified by a user prior to storing the configuration information in a database such as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Based on the above description, a skilled technician can make and use the invention with no undue burden of experimentation.

With respect to the claimed computer-implemented method of identifying one of a plurality business sites, it appears that the Examiner has not accurately reproduced the claim language that recites as follows:

1. A computer-implemented method comprising:
....
extracting at least a subset of the configuration information from the database based on an extraction parameter identifying one of a plurality of business sites;....

This language is fully supported by the present specification. For example, as discussed above, according to the present specification, Figure 3 illustrates one embodiment of an alert management system 300 that includes a configuration database 320 and a configuration generator 330 (page 13, para [0066]); Figure 6 illustrates “one embodiment of a configuration generator in the form of digital processing system 600 representing an exemplary workstation, personal computer, server, etc., in which features of the present invention may be implemented” (page 18, para [0082]); Figure 4 illustrates a flow diagram of one embodiment of a method for generating a TelAlert configuration file by the alert management system 300 (pages 13-14, para [0067]). Hence, it is apparent from the above descriptions of Figures 3, 4 and 6 that the method illustrated in Figure 4 is computer-implemented.

Furthermore, the detailed description of Figure 4 specifically states that the method for generating a TelAlert configuration file includes extracting at least a subset of configuration information from a database based on an extraction parameter identifying one of multiple business sites. For example, the detailed description of Figure 4 states the following with respect to one embodiment of the method for generating a TelAlert configuration file:

When the configuration generator is executed, it is given an indication as to what business sites to extract configuration information for (e.g., a parameter indicating the extraction of business site A configuration information). The configuration generator will then extract the configuration information for this specific business site only.

(Specification, page 16, para [0075])

Thus, the specification contains a clear and concise description of the claimed computer-implemented method of extracting at least a subset of configuration information from a database based on an extraction parameter identifying one of multiple business sites such as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the

inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Based on the above description, a skilled technician can make and use the invention with no undue burden of experimentation.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, 7-9, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27-31, 33, 34, 37, 40, 43-45, 47, 50, 53, 54, 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mayer, et al., (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0178246, hereinafter "Mayer"). Claims 2, 22, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer and in view of Brown, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0020750, hereinafter "Brown"). Claims 3, 6, 14, 23, 26, 38 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, in view of Pellegrinelli, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0010618, hereinafter "Pellegrinelli"). Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Takahashi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,968,124, hereinafter "Takahashi"). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Patterson, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0052941, hereinafter "Patterson"). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Elliott, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0064149, hereinafter "Elliott"). Claims 19, 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Detlef, et al. (U.S. Patent

Application No. 2002/0112021, hereinafter "Detlef"). Claims 41 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Wolf, et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0178380, hereinafter "Wolf"). Claims 42 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Mayer, Pellegrinelli and Wolf, and further in view of Garcia, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,883,170, hereinafter "Garcia").

With respect to Mayer, the presently claimed invention predates the Mayer reference because the presently claimed invention was reduced to practice prior to March 27, 2001, i.e., the effective filing date of the provisional application for the Mayer reference. The Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 is submitted herewith to swear behind the Mayer reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner no longer consider the Mayer reference as prior art for the presently claimed invention.

Pellegrinelli does not render the present invention unpatentable. Pellegrinelli describes a method for distributing performance data associated with a customer from a distribution site to a user site. Pellegrinelli discloses storing configuration information in a database. However, Pellegrinelli does not teach or suggest validating configuration information to be stored in a database, and then generating a text-based configuration file including at least a subset of the configuration information that is extracted from the database based on an extraction parameter identifying one of multiple business sites.

These features are included in the following language of claim 1:

... validating configuration information pertaining to alert messages to be sent to a plurality of destinations, the configuration information being specified by a user;
storing the configuration information in a database;
extracting at least a subset of the configuration information from the database based on an extraction parameter identifying one of a plurality of business sites;
and

generating a text-based configuration file containing the extracted configuration information.

Similar language is included in independent claims 21, 34 and 45. Thus, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45 is patentable over Pellegrinelli.

Furthermore, the above features of the present invention are also missing from each of the other references (i.e., Brown, Takahashi, Patterson, Elliott, Detlef, Wolf and Garcia) cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 21, 34 and 45, and their corresponding dependent claims 2,3, 5-20, 22, 23, 25-33, 35-38, 40-44, 46-48, 50-54, 57 and 58. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, applicant respectfully submits that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.


If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: December 22, 2006


Benjamin A. Kimes
Registration No. 50,870

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300